

Conversent Communications, LLC

RECEIVED

FEB - 7 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of SecretaryVIA HAND DELIVERY

February 7, 2003

Ex Parte

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Room TW-A325
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: **WC Docket No. 02-237, Verizon Section 63.71 Application to Discontinue
Expanded Interconnection Service Through Physical Collocation**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On January 29, 2003, I filed an *ex parte* letter with the Commission in the above-referenced docket. The purpose of this letter filed today is to clarify two factual errors that appeared in both the public and proprietary versions of the January 29th letter.

Footnote 6 of the January 29th letter said:

Conversant also reduced the amps it orders under state collocation arrangements to 20 amps on the A-feed and 20 amps on the B-feed. Verizon does not bill on a fused amp basis under state collocation tariffs so Conversant is only billed for 40 amps per feed under such arrangements

The word "feed" should be deleted from the second sentence of footnote 6 and replaced with "fuse panel." The revised footnote 6 should read:

Conversant also reduced the amps it orders under state collocation arrangements to 20 amps on the A-feed and 20 amps on the B-feed. Verizon does not bill on a fused amp basis under state collocation tariffs so Conversant is only billed for 40 amps per fuse panel under such arrangements.

02-237-012
02/07/03

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
February 7, 2003
Page 2

Footnote 7 of the January 29th letter said:

This is because Conversent estimates that its equipment may draw up to 40 amps.


Footnote 7 should be revised to include at the end of the sentence “per collocation arrangement (includes two fuse panels).” The revised footnote 7 should read:

This is because Conversent estimates that its equipment may draw up to 40 amps per collocation arrangement (includes two fuse panels).

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

In accordance with the Commission’s rules, I hereby submit to the Secretary of the Commission in the above-captioned proceeding two copies of this written *ex parte* presentation made on behalf of Conversent Communications.

Sincerely,


Scott Sawyer

Vice President-Regulatory Affairs
CONVERSENT COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

cc: Joseph DiBella
Jennifer McKee
Tamara Preiss
Jeffrey Dygert

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED
Conversent Communications, LLC

ORIGINAL
RECEIVED

FEB - 7 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

VIA HAND DELIVERY
February 7, 2003

Ex Parte

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Room TW-A325
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: **WC Docket No. 02-237, Verizon Section 63.71 Application to Discontinue
Expanded Interconnection Service Through Physical Collocation**

Dear Ms. Dortch:

On January 29, 2003, I filed an *ex parte* letter with the Commission in the above referenced docket. The purpose of this letter filed today is to clarify two factual errors that appeared in both the public and proprietary versions of the January 29th letter.

Footnote 6 of the January 29th letter said:

Conversant also reduced the amps it orders under state collocation arrangements to 20 amps on the A-feed and 20 amps on the B-feed. Verizon does not bill on a fused amp basis under state collocation tariffs so Conversant is only billed for 40 amps per feed under such arrangements.

The word "feed" should be deleted from the second sentence of footnote 6 and replaced with "fuse panel." The revised footnote 6 should read:

Conversant also reduced the amps it orders under state collocation arrangements to 20 amps on the A-feed and 20 amps on the B-feed. Verizon does not bill on a fused amp basis under state collocation tariffs so Conversant is only billed for 40 amps per fuse panel under such arrangements.

Footnote 7 of the January 29" letter said:

This is because Conversent estimates that its equipment may draw up to 40 amps.


Footnote 7 should be revised to include at the end of the sentence "per collocation arrangement (includes two fuse panels)." The revised footnote 7 should read:

This is because Conversent estimates that its equipment may draw up to 40 amps per collocation arrangement (includes two fuse panels).

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

In accordance with the Commission's rules, I hereby submit to the Secretary of the Commission in the above-captioned proceeding two copies of this written *ex parte* presentation made on behalf of Conversent Communications.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Scott Sawyer" followed by a stylized flourish or initials.

Scott Sawyer

Vice President-Regulatory Affairs
CONVERSENT COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

cc: Joseph DiBella
Jennifer McKee
Tamara Preiss
Jeffrey Dygert